

more likely children would be food insecure; 36 percent more likely to be in poor health if this happens; 70 percent more likely to be at risk for developmental delays—this is about our kids, about our children—12 percent more likely to be hospitalized; children in kindergarten through third grade would be more likely to have measurably lower reading and math test scores; and reduced SNAP benefits would decrease the likelihood of mothers having a baby with a healthy weight and of a low-birth-weight baby surviving.

This is not JIM MCGOVERN or GWEN MOORE or BOBBY SCOTT or ROSA DELAURO making up these statistics. They come from an organization which tracks all of these measures.

□ 1630

My colleagues, it would include drug testing policies for SNAP recipients and prohibitions for certain food purchases.

What kind of priorities are these?

We can't continue to wage a war against food stamp recipients. Nobody is asking for any other recipients who get Federal subsidies to be drug tested. Let's start with the Crop Insurance people. Let's start with that. Let's take all of the programs at the U.S. Department of Agriculture where there is a subsidy and a recipient to that subsidy. Let's get them all drug tested.

We are going to continue to stand up against unconscionable attacks on America's poor working families. I urge my colleagues to stand with us in ensuring that the Federal budget does not harm working families and children by decimating the hunger programs in this Nation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for her eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman so much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in praising Mr. MCGOVERN for his leadership on this issue.

Of the many people who are hungry, none of them have the money to lobby folks—the kids, the disabled people, the seniors, the elderly—but we have a champion in this House, JIM MCGOVERN.

With the few seconds remaining, I want to talk a little bit about our economy. We have a capitalist economy, and it is countercyclical. The SNAP program works to provide a safety net so that when we have a Hurricane Katrina or when we have a Hurricane Sandy, the food stamp rolls go up, and when there are jobs, the food stamp rolls go down. It ain't broke, you all, so let's not try to fix it.

I am very, very disturbed that when the Budget Committee meets next week, it will try to make structural changes to the SNAP program, to throw it into a reconciliation process where only 51 Members of the Senate have to vote for it, out of this body, in

order to change the structure of it so that it is not responsive to people during economic distress.

I am concerned about the numbers of people who are going to ask for a waiver to limit the number of benefits, in a 36-month period, that those who are unemployed can receive. People who are unemployed don't have any control over our economy. When unemployment is up, the SNAP program, as it is currently structured, is responsive to unemployment, and we ought to stick to that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

END HUNGER NOW

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their eloquent statements here today. I think that they have reinforced the point that these nutrition programs work. SNAP works. It has one of the lowest error rates of any Federal program—less than a 4 percent error rate. That includes underpayments, which means that beneficiaries don't get what they are entitled to. It is a program that allows families to put food on the table.

We need to be supporting these programs. We need to be coming up with a holistic plan to end hunger. We need to raise the minimum wage so that people who work, like the majority of able-bodied people do who are on SNAP, don't have to live in poverty. We can do so much better.

I would just say to my Republican colleagues that, rather than doubling down on the cruelty with some of the proposals that have been brought forth before this House, you ought to work in a bipartisan way to actually lift people out of poverty so as to give people the hope and the ability to lead better lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to come together and find a way to end hunger now.

STOP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to talk about an issue that I started bringing up about 5 or 6 weeks ago and that I intend to talk about every week until we finally force action in this Chamber.

For over 20 years, I have had the opportunity to study this institution, an institution I believe very deeply in—in its ability to rise to some of our greatest national challenges and to solve some of the greatest problems we face. It was not until as a first-time candidate then elected to office that I had the opportunity to experience a few moments that are very unique to actually being in the Member's chair.

We have had a great debate over the decades about campaign finance reform, about the role of money in politics. It is a legitimate debate. It is a legitimate conversation with strongly felt views on both sides of the aisle, with solutions as diverse as the ideologies of our country—from greater transparency to greater limits, to fewer limits.

Yet, as we have talked about the campaign finance construct in this country and as we have talked about proposed solutions, we have actually ignored one of the greatest blights on this body, itself. It comes not in the form of our campaign finance laws, but it comes in the form of the amount of time that Members of this body are expected or are, in some cases, directed to spend in raising money.

You see, the first way we begin to address campaign finance reform is by addressing a needed congressional reform, a reform that touches not on the current laws of how campaigns are resourced, but on the current rules by which this body governs.

As they were directed a few years back by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—by their leadership—the expectation as a new Member of Congress for a day in D.C. is to spend 4 hours a day on the phone, raising money. The number-one activity, as was suggested to new incoming Members, was to fundraise, not to legislate.

It is a very uncomfortable truth. As I said last week, it is very uncomfortable for me to talk about this amongst my colleagues, but we represent, each of us, 700,000 people back home who trust us. They trust us to serve, and in serving, we are to give voice to their priorities.

Dear folks, the priorities of our constituents is not fundraising. You see, there is a broad diversity of priorities—from border security, to immigration reform, to transportation, to tax reform. I listened to colleagues in the last hour talk about balancing the budget. Others talked about programs that are critical to ending hunger here in the United States, but we will never solve these problems on behalf of the people who sent us here if we spend more time on the phone, raising money, than we do in legislating, in tackling these very problems that we have tried to give voice to.

Last week I did share with this body the orientation card that was provided to some incoming Members a few years back. Today I have with me some quotes from retiring Members of Congress, from those on the way out the door or who have already left.

The first one, you will notice, is a confession from a colleague on my side of the aisle, upon his retirement, who said that fundraising is the main business of Congress.

The other one is from the retired Senate majority leader who said that a Senator has to raise \$10,000 a day every day he is in office, every day for 6 years, simply to finance his reelection.